

6/29/00 Suttie Dep.

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL V.  
HAMILTON SUNDSTRAND

PETER J. SUTTIE

06/29/00

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.,  
and HONEYWELL INTELLECTUAL  
PROPERTY, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

HAMILTON SUNDSTRAND CORPORATION,

Defendant.

No. 99-309 (GMS)

DEPOSITION OF PETER J. SUTTIE  
San Diego, California  
Thursday, June 29, 2000  
Volume 2

Reported by:  
RENEE KELCH  
CSR No. 5063  
Job No. 14814

192

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiffs:

KIRKLAND & ELLIS  
BY: JONATHAN F. PUTNAM  
BY: VICKIE REZNIK  
Attorneys at Law  
153 East 53rd Street  
New York, New York 10022-4675  
(212) 446-4695

For Defendant:

MARSHALL, O'TOOLE, GERSTEIN, MURRAY & BORUN  
BY: WILLIAM E. MCCrackEN  
BY: THOMAS A. MILLER  
Attorneys at Law  
233 South Wacker Drive  
6300 Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6402  
(312) 474-6300

Also Present:

BEN SMALL, Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation

194

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.,  
and HONEYWELL INTELLECTUAL  
PROPERTY, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

HAMILTON SUNDSTRAND CORPORATION,

Defendant.

No. 99-309 (GMS)

Deposition of PETER J. SUTTIE,  
Volume 2, taken on behalf of  
Plaintiffs, at 600 West Broadway,  
Suite 1100, San Diego, California,  
beginning at 9:18 a.m. and ending at  
3:39 p.m. on Thursday, June 29, 2000,  
before RENEE KELCH, Certified  
Shorthand Reporter No. 5063.

193

INDEX

WITNESS

PETER J. SUTTIE  
Volume 2

EXAMINATION

BY MR. PUTNAM

198

EXHIBITS

DEPOSITION

PAGE

42	Document labeled, "Troubleshooting guide"	202
43	Handwritten notes and coordination memo from G. Hardy, dated 02/03/93	244
44	Memo from P. Suttie, dated October 16, 1990	271
45	Document labeled "ECB interfaces,"	277
46	Multi-page document Bates numbered HSA 176217 through HSA 176295	290
47	Coordination memo from G. Hardy, dated December 18, 1992	300
48	Coordination memo from P. Biscay, dated 13/1/93	301
49	Memo from Ed Edelman to Pete Suttie, dated April 4, 1993	316
50	Document labeled, "Design verification"	320

195

1 (Pages 192 to 195)

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES  
(619) 233-0633 (800) 829-6159

1 Tuesday, I noticed this statement.  
2 Q And what, if any, actions have you taken to  
3 have this supposedly erroneous statement corrected?  
4 A None.  
5 Q Have you, or to your knowledge anyone at  
6 Sundstrand, contacted any customers who've been given  
7 this troubleshooting guide to tell them that there's an  
8 erroneous statement about inlet guide vane position and  
9 setpoint contained in the guide you've given them?  
10 A No.  
11 Q If you look at page HSA 240113, sir. At the  
12 bottom of that page, or near the bottom of that page --  
13 A 240143?  
14 Q 113. Do you see in the middle column near the  
15 bottom of the page it says IGVACTR, and then P21?  
16 A I see it -- which particular? Yes.  
17 Q Actually, those two abbreviations followed by  
18 P21 occurs a couple different places on this page;  
19 correct?  
20 A Yes.  
21 Q First of all, IGVACTR, is that an abbreviation  
22 or shorthand for inlet guide vane actuator?  
23 A Yes.  
24 Q And is that a line replaceable unit in the  
25 APS 3200 as you defined the term a couple minutes ago?

236

1 define?  
2 A Well, B factor itself was the parameter.  
3 Q And how was the B factor used? Or how was it  
4 contemplated that the B factor would be used in the APS  
5 3200?  
6 A It was used to determine which side of curve,  
7 known as the delta P on P curve, the load compressor was  
8 running on.  
9 Q Which you say "which side of the curve," what  
10 do you mean?  
11 A As I mentioned in the previous deposition,  
12 there is a relationship between delta P on P and flow,  
13 air compressor flow. There is not a unique solution one  
14 needs to know which -- the curve has an apex for  
15 accurate control. The ECB needs to know which side of  
16 that curve the load compressor is functioning.  
17 Q Is the B factor something that's used in the  
18 current APS 3200 today?  
19 A No.  
20 Q Why not?  
21 A It was -- it did not adequately accomplish the  
22 function.  
23 Q What function?  
24 A To determine which side of the curve the load  
25 compressor was functioning on.

238

1 A Yes.  
2 Q And am I correct that this document, Suttie  
3 Exhibit 42, is using the designation P21 to refer to the  
4 inlet guide vane actuator?  
5 A Yes.  
6 Q And am I right that the inlet guide vane  
7 actuator is the piece of hardware that physically opens  
8 or closes the inlet guide vanes?  
9 A Yes.  
10 Q And that's the piece of hardware whose position  
11 is measured by the electronic control box in the  
12 APS 3200; correct?  
13 A Can you repeat that for me, please?  
14 (Record read.)  
15 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
16 BY MR. PUTNAM:  
17 Q Let me get another document for you.  
18 Mr. Suttie, during the development of the  
19 APS 3200 was there a term or a variable that was  
20 referred to as the B, B as in boy, factor?  
21 A Yes.  
22 Q What was the B factor?  
23 A It was an equation, an algorithm to define a  
24 parameter.  
25 Q And what parameter was the B factor used to

237

1 Q What's used in the APS 3200 currently in  
2 operation today instead of the B factor?  
3 A A pressure ratio measurement.  
4 Q Is that delta P over P?  
5 A No.  
6 Q What is that pressure ratio measurement?  
7 A It's P -- the load compressor outlet pressure  
8 ratio to the load compressor inlet pressure.  
9 Q Isn't that -- haven't you just defined delta P  
10 over P?  
11 A No.  
12 Q What's the difference between what you just  
13 defined and delta P over P?  
14 A Inlet air goes into the load compressor,  
15 ambient air is taken into the load compressor, and that  
16 is discharged over the load compressor at a high  
17 pressure. That is the pressure ratio across the  
18 machine. Delta P is as we have described it.  
19 Now, you could say that the pressure ratio I've  
20 just discussed is a delta, yes, I agree. But the delta,  
21 as we have discussed it, is a delta between pressure in  
22 the diffuser and the pressure in the load compressor  
23 outlet duct. So it is -- and the P of the delta P on P  
24 as we described it, all static pressures, is the duct  
25 pressure.

239

1 operation?  
2 A Yes.  
3 Q When was it used?  
4 A In the software versions prior to 3.0.  
5 Q And what time frame is that?  
6 A From entry into service, January, '94, so it's  
7 sometime in '95. I don't know exactly.  
8 Q How was B critical used during that period of  
9 time?  
10 A It was compared with the computed B factor to  
11 determine which side of the delta B on B curve we're  
12 operating on.  
13 Q And what did the system do once it was  
14 determined which side of the delta P over P curve you  
15 were operating on? What did it do with that  
16 information?  
17 A It used that determination to cause the bleed  
18 valve, control valve commanded position to be effective,  
19 or to be ignored.  
20 Q And when you say the bleed control valve  
21 commanded position, do you mean the position generated  
22 by the delta P over P measurement?  
23 A I mean the control logic, which we have  
24 discussed earlier, related to P on P, which produced a  
25 signal called BCVCTL, I believe.

248

1 for the APS 3200 was installed in the field, would that  
2 be the time that the change-over was made?  
3 A Yes. With the caveat that 3.2, as it finally  
4 ended up being, was recalled for a period, for another  
5 reason; previous version of software was used again for  
6 a while until version 4.1 entered service.  
7 Q And when did that recall and relapse to the  
8 earlier version take place?  
9 A '95, '96.  
10 Q And what's the relationship between 3.0 and  
11 3.2?  
12 A I don't recall.  
13 Q Okay. Just so we have the testimony sequenced  
14 correct. Is it your testimony that until version 3.0 of  
15 the software was released, the APU used the B factor to  
16 B critical comparison, that there was then a period when  
17 APUs did not do that, a period again where APUs did do  
18 that while a software bug was being fixed, and then when  
19 version 4.1 entered service APUs never -- APUs  
20 thereafter did not operate using the B factor and B  
21 critical?  
22 A Correct.  
23 Q So if we find out when version 4.1 entered  
24 service, after that date and after that software was  
25 installed on every given APU in service, there was no

250

1 Q As I understand it, all APS 3200s that went  
2 into service between January, 1994 and sometime in 1995,  
3 used the B factor compared to B critical, as you've just  
4 described it; is that right?  
5 A Yes.  
6 Q Do APUs that went into service during that  
7 period still operate that way, or was their software  
8 changed?  
9 A Software was changed.  
10 Q So am I right that APUs that went into service  
11 after this period in 1995 -- first of all, that APUs  
12 that went into service after the period of 1995 never  
13 used the B factor compared to B critical in actual  
14 operation?  
15 A Correct.  
16 Q And APUs that had gone into service during that  
17 first year and a half or so used the B factor compared  
18 to B critical during their initial in-service operation,  
19 but then had their software reprogrammed to no longer  
20 use those factors?  
21 A Correct.  
22 Q And that reprogramming took place sometime in  
23 1995; is that your testimony?  
24 A Sometime in '95. Or early '96.  
25 Q And if we found out when software version 3.0

249

1 use of the B factor and B critical; correct?  
2 A Correct.  
3 Q Now, during the time the B factor and B  
4 critical was in actual use for the APS 3200, am I right  
5 that as shown on this chart here on Exhibit Suttie 43, B  
6 critical was a function of inlet guide vane position?  
7 A Can you define again what you mean by is a  
8 function of?  
9 Q Well, let me ask you an open-ended question.  
10 What was the relationship between B critical and inlet  
11 guide vane position when B critical was in use for the  
12 APS 3200?  
13 A The relationship was as defined in this table.  
14 Q So when B critical was in use for the APS 3200,  
15 a given inlet guide vane position produced a given B  
16 critical value; is that right?  
17 A Correct.  
18 Q And that B critical value was then compared to  
19 the measured B factor; correct?  
20 A Yes.  
21 Q And was proportional and integral control  
22 applied to the difference between the B critical factor  
23 and the measured B factor?  
24 A No.  
25 Q Was any type of control compared -- applied to

251

15 (Pages 248 to 251)

10/24/00 Suttie Dep.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWAREHONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.,  
and HONEYWELL INTELLECTUAL  
PROPERTY, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

No. 99-309 (GMS)

HAMILTON SUNDSTRAND CORPORATION,

Defendant.

DEPOSITION OF PETER JOHN SUTTIE  
San Diego, California  
Tuesday, October 24, 2000  
Volume III

Reported by:

JESSICA E. MASSE  
CSR No. 9910  
JOB No. 16831

337

## 1 APPEARANCES:

2 For the Plaintiffs:

3 KIRKLAND & ELLIS  
4 BY: VICKIE REZNIK  
Attorney at Law  
5 153 East 53rd Street  
New York, New York 10022  
(212) 446-4695

6 For the Defendant:

7 MARSHALL, O'TOOLE, GERSTEIN, MURRAY & BORUN  
8 BY: WILLIAM E. MCCracken  
-and-  
9 THOMAS A. MILLER  
10 Attorneys at Law  
233 South Wacker Drive  
11 6300 Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
12 (312) 474-6300

13 Also Present:

14 RICHARD H. KOSAKOWSKI

339

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWAREHONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.,  
and HONEYWELL INTELLECTUAL  
PROPERTY, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

No. 99-309 (GMS)

HAMILTON SUNDSTRAND CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Deposition of PETER JOHN SUTTIE,  
Volume III, taken on behalf of  
Plaintiffs, at 501 West Broadway, Suite  
1300, San Diego, California, beginning at  
9:18 a.m. and ending at 5:11 p.m. on  
Tuesday, October 24, 2000, before JESSICA  
E. MASSE, Certified Shorthand Reporter  
No. 9910.

338

1 INDEX  
2 WITNESS: EXAMINATION  
3 PETER JOHN SUTTIE  
Volume III

4 BY MS. REZNIK 342

## EXHIBITS

PLAINTIFFS'	PAGE
229 Honeywell's third notice of deposition	343
230 Coordination memo dated 1/19/93	361
231 Coordination memo dated 2/5/93	362
232 Coordination memo dated 1/29/93	366
233 Coordination memo dated 12/15/92	373
234 Coordination memo dated 10/13/93	379
235 Coordination memo dated 12/1/93	386
236 Coordination memo dated 12/7/93	388
237 Software problem report	391
238 ECB S/W test reports	392
239 Memo dated 2/1/93	398
240 BA meeting, Hamburg, August 12-13, 1993	399

340



(Plaintiffs' Exhibit 233 was marked for identification by the court reporter.)

3 BY MS. REZNIK:

4 Q Exhibit 233 is a coordination memo; correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And the coordination memo is authored by T, period, Maedche; correct?

8 A Correct.

9 Q And that refers to Terry Maedche?

10 A Correct.

11 Q What is the subject of this coordination memo?

12 A Load compressor data.

13 Q Can you read the first line of the coordination memo for me, please?

15 A "SPS is currently conducting final surge system development testing, computer" --

17 Q First sentence of the coordination memo, please.

19 A "SPS is currently conducting final surge system development testing, computer simulation correlation, and surge system tolerance analysis."

22 Q Was Mr. Maedche involved in the final surge system development testing referenced in this memo?

24 A He was involved; yes.

25 Q Was Mr. Maedche involved in the computer

373

1 A Terry Maedche wrote this coordination memo. As  
2 I mentioned previously, he was part of the development  
3 team. He was working with others to do this system  
4 development. So I can't say for sure whether it was  
5 someone else's idea or not.

6 Q When you said "this engineer's request," you  
7 were referring to Terry Maedche; correct?

8 A I was referring to the writer of this coord  
9 memo, which is Terry Maedche, yes.

10 Q Was Mr. Maedche involved in the surge system  
11 tolerance analysis, described in the first sentence of  
12 this coordination memo, for the APS 3200?

13 A Yes.

14 Q What is the purpose of surge system tolerance  
15 analysis?

16 A When evaluating a system, or any part for that  
17 matter, not all components behave exactly the same. We  
18 make 100 load compressors. They don't all behave  
19 exactly the same. There is a tolerance. To make sure  
20 that a system works correctly, you need to allot for  
21 that variation between the different pieces of hardware.  
22 And so when designing a system with enough allowance for  
23 the tolerances -- and so that was what was being done  
24 here.

25 The control system has many components. It's

375

simulation correlation of the APS 3200 related to the  
2 load compressor data?

3 A We never had a good computer simulation of this  
4 system. So while we may have tried to have correlation  
5 between computer analysis and actual test data, it was  
6 never successful.

7 Q So it's your testimony that you never did a  
8 computer simulation correlation test on the APS 3200?

9 A A computer simulation correlation test, no.  
10 That wouldn't be a computer simulation. It would be a  
11 computer program, which is intended to simulate real  
12 hardware. We never had a good computer model. It's  
13 very complicated, and we never had a good model. So we  
14 did our system development on engine tests, as I've  
15 mentioned to you previously. This was an attempt to get  
16 data to do a computer simulation correlation. It was  
17 this engineer's request to do this, as stated here, but  
18 it's not --

19 Q I'm sorry. Continue.

20 A But we were never very successful at doing  
21 simulation of the system.

22 Q You said this was an attempt to get data to do  
23 a computer simulation correlation based on the  
24 engineer's request. This engineer's request meaning  
25 Terry Maedche?

374

1 got sensors. It's got the load compressor itself. You  
2 need to add up all those tolerances to make sure that  
3 the system will always work as required by the  
4 customer -- all days, all temperatures, all locations,  
5 all altitudes as specified.

6 Q So it was part of Mr. Maedche's job to request  
7 these various surge and tolerance analysis tests for the  
8 APS 3200?

9 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat that, please?  
10 (Record read.)

11 THE WITNESS: There are multiple things there.  
12 This was a request for data from Turbomeca. What you  
13 also mentioned was testing, which he was not requesting.  
14 It was testing that was being carried out in San Diego.  
15 So what he was requesting here was basic performance  
16 data for the load compressor.

17 BY MS. REZNIK:

18 Q Would Mr. Maedche be involved in analyzing that  
19 data?

20 A Typically not a systems engineer. This is  
21 primarily performance information which you get from a  
22 performance engineer. The only reason the systems  
23 engineer would be interested in this is if we were  
24 building a simulation -- a computer program that I  
25 mentioned previously.

375

control system. You only do what's minimally necessary to make the system function properly. To add extra features could have a detrimental effect. So it was not necessary. We did not include IGVs.

Q Did you ever test any version of any APU that included the surge control system depicted in Exhibit 22 or Exhibit 74?

A No.

Q So the information you obtained from Turbomeca relating to the delta P/P setpoint wasn't derived from testing of an APU; is that correct?

A The information we got from Turbomeca -- and you've shown it already in one of the exhibits -- was a relationship between delta P on P and flow. It was derived from rig testing of Turbomeca's hardware and equipment in France. They then gave us the relationship which we used in our control system. It was independent of IGVs as it's stated on the figure you've shown me earlier.

Q Do you know what type of testing was done by Turbomeca?

A You need to ask Turbomeca.

Q So Turbomeca never shared with you the basis of their testing of hardware in deriving the delta P/P flow relationship?

465

Q And Mr. Hardy from Turbomeca was the program manager of this APS 3000 at the time of the 3000 development?

A At Turbomeca. Only responsible for the Turbomeca portion.

Q Let me know if I've got this correct. Is it fair to say that you are not prepared to tell me where Turbomeca has derived the information regarding the unnecessary relationship between the IGVs angle and the setpoint?

MR. MCCracken: Objection; ambiguous and vague.

THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question, please?

MS. REZNIK: Why don't I restate it for you.

Q Are you able to identify for me how Turbomeca derived the information they provided to you on this October 25th, 1991 coordination memo between the relationship of IGV angle and the setpoint?

A They derived that information from rig tests of a compressor. They measured the air flow, measured delta P on P, and through laborious tasks created the relationship by measuring many points and just plotting them along the chart.

Q So is it your testimony that after October 25th, 1991 Sundstrand no longer used variations in

467

A I never saw the rate they used.

Q You never saw it, but did they ever provide you with any information about the rig testing that they conducted?

A They gave us the data that they collected. That's all the information I care about. I can think of what the rig might have looked like, but I never saw it. I don't really -- it's not really an issue to us. We wanted the output data, which we used.

Q Can you tell me when Turbomeca provided you the information stating that the IGV angles didn't need to affect the setpoint?

A It's written in one of the coord memos. October 25th, 1991.

Q And Turbomeca provided this information in the form of a coordination memo?

A Yes. From Gerard Hardy.

Q Mr. Hardy was your counterpart in Turbomeca; is that correct?

A No. Not at that time.

Q What was his role?

A He was the program manager at that time. His counterpart -- I was the control systems project engineer. So in hierarchy structure, I would have been seen as junior to Mr. Hardy.

466

position of the IGV to determine the delta P/P setpoint?

A We never used variations of IGV to establish the delta P on P setpoint. After October 25th, the control -- architecture of the control philosophy changed to incorporate the data from Turbomeca and to delete any reference to IGVs affecting the delta P on P setpoint.

Q So, then, it's fair to say that after October 25th, 1991 Sundstrand no longer contemplated using variations in position of IGVs to affect the delta P/P setpoint?

A That would be a fair statement, yes.

Q Is it fair to say the sole basis for Sundstrand's abandonment of that idea was Turbomeca's data supplied to you in this October 25th, 1991 coordination memo?

A Yes.

Q So Sundstrand didn't do any independent testing or analysis to determine whether or not the relationship between the IGV angle and delta P/P setpoint would work?

A No, we did not.

Q And aside from the rig testing and lead compressor testing by Turbomeca that you think went on, you can't tell me if there was any other basis Turbomeca had for providing you with this information in the

468



12/6/05 Clark Dep.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL, INC., )  
and HONEYWELL INTELLECTUAL )  
PROPERTIES, INC., )

Plaintiffs, )

vs. )

No. 99-309-GMS

HAMILTON SUNDSTRAND CORP., )

Defendant. )

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF JIM CROCKER CLARK  
Volume 1 (Pages 1- 278)  
Phoenix, Arizona  
December 6, 2005  
10:00 a.m.

PREPARED FOR:  
District Court  
(Original)

PREPARED BY:  
Robin L. B. Osterode, RPR, CSR  
AZ Certified Reporter No. 50695

<p>1 called the throat.</p> <p>2 Q. And the converging/diverging nozzle has a</p> <p>3 back end that has a wider opening, correct?</p> <p>4 A. The back end expands in area.</p> <p>5 Q. And that's called the discharge, am I</p> <p>6 right?</p> <p>7 A. The end of it you can call it the</p> <p>8 discharge.</p> <p>9 Q. In a converging/diverging nozzle, you</p> <p>10 have a lower pressure at the throat, generally, and a</p> <p>11 higher pressure at the discharge, correct?</p> <p>12 A. The lowest pressure will be in the</p> <p>13 throat.</p> <p>14 Q. And the purpose --</p> <p>15 A. Oh --</p> <p>16 Q. Go ahead.</p> <p>17 A. You can lower -- you could lower the</p> <p>18 downstream pressures so much that it would choke and</p> <p>19 the lowest pressure would be at the exit.</p> <p>20 Q. I want to talk about choke in a minute,</p> <p>21 but let's put aside choke conditions, okay?</p> <p>22 A. Could you repeat your question, so we can</p> <p>23 get back on?</p> <p>24 Q. Sure. The lowest pressure in a</p> <p>25 converging/diverging nozzle is generally at the</p>	<p>58</p> <p>1 A. Those are in my textbook.</p> <p>2 Q. In your 1950s Shapiro textbook?</p> <p>3 A. Right.</p> <p>4 Q. Do -- does the position of the inlet</p> <p>5 guide vanes affect the flow-related parameter in a</p> <p>6 surge control system?</p> <p>7 MS. STEVENSON: Objection, vague and</p> <p>8 incomplete hypothetical.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Can you -- I've already</p> <p>10 stated you can change the inlet guide vanes and</p> <p>11 change flow.</p> <p>12 BY MR. LIND:</p> <p>13 Q. And if you change the inlet guide vanes</p> <p>14 and change flow, you're going to change the value of</p> <p>15 the flow-related parameter, correct?</p> <p>16 MS. STEVENSON: Objection, vague.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: If you change the inlet</p> <p>18 guide vanes and change flow, the flow rate parameter</p> <p>19 is going to change.</p> <p>20 BY MR. LIND:</p> <p>21 Q. And that's because the pressures that are</p> <p>22 being measured in the flow-related parameter are</p> <p>23 going to change because of the change in the inlet</p> <p>24 guide vane pressure?</p> <p>25 A. The pressures are changing because the</p> <p>60</p>
<p>1 throat of the nozzle, correct?</p> <p>2 A. It depends on how much you back-pressure</p> <p>3 the nozzle. It can be -- the discharge can be</p> <p>4 greater or it can be less than the throat.</p> <p>5 Q. When you have subsonic flow through a</p> <p>6 converging/diverging nozzle, you'll have lower</p> <p>7 pressure at the throat than at the discharge,</p> <p>8 correct?</p> <p>9 A. When you have subsonic flow.</p> <p>10 Q. And when you have supersonic flow in a</p> <p>11 converging/diverging nozzle, you can have lower</p> <p>12 pressure actually at the back end of that nozzle,</p> <p>13 correct?</p> <p>14 A. When you have supersonic flow, you can</p> <p>15 get a shockwave in there and you'll have lower</p> <p>16 pressure than at the throat.</p> <p>17 Q. And those same principles apply to a</p> <p>18 diffuser, correct?</p> <p>19 MS. STEVENSON: Object to the form.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Those same principles in</p> <p>21 the areas expanding, that's true.</p> <p>22 BY MR. LIND:</p> <p>23 Q. And those are principles that you have</p> <p>24 understood and learned about going, again, back to</p> <p>25 your college days, correct?</p> <p>59</p>	<p>1 flow is changing.</p> <p>2 Q. And the flow is changing because the</p> <p>3 inlet guide vane position is changing?</p> <p>4 A. If that's all you did.</p> <p>5 Q. Were -- did the 165-9 APU have inlet</p> <p>6 guide vanes?</p> <p>7 A. The 165-9 does not have inlet guide</p> <p>8 vanes.</p> <p>9 MR. LIND: And we're going to ask on the</p> <p>10 record, and we'll follow up, that documents relating</p> <p>11 to the 165-9 be produced, because they're, based on</p> <p>12 his testimony, they're going to be relevant as well</p> <p>13 and have always been relevant to our document</p> <p>14 request.</p> <p>15 MS. STEVENSON: I disagree with that</p> <p>16 characterization, but we can deal with it off the</p> <p>17 record.</p> <p>18 BY MR. LIND:</p> <p>19 Q. Are you familiar with the concept of</p> <p>20 compressor surge?</p> <p>21 A. Yes, I've heard of compressor surge.</p> <p>22 I've worked on surge systems, so I'm familiar with</p> <p>23 the concept.</p> <p>24 Q. And again, the concept of compressor</p> <p>25 surge is a concept that goes back to your college</p> <p>61</p>

16 (Pages 58 to 61)

90

1 BY MR. LIND:

2 Q. Mr. Clark, in the late 1970s in  
3 connection with the F-18 aircraft, Honeywell used  
4 inlet guide vane position as an input into its surge  
5 control system, correct?

6 A. No. It's a fully pneumatic system and it  
7 did not use inlet guide vane position.

8 Q. Okay. In -- when was the first time that  
9 Honeywell conceived of using inlet guide vane  
10 position as an input into its surge control system?

11 A. I -- I couldn't say for sure, the first  
12 time we ever used it was on a 331-200.

13 Q. And you know that that surge control  
14 system was developed or conceived of at least in the  
15 late 1970s, correct?

16 A. I don't know the exact dates on when  
17 we -- I can't remember the exact I worked on it but  
18 can't remember the exact dates, whether it was late  
19 '70s, early '80s, I can't remember.

20 Q. And when did Honeywell first conceive of  
21 incorporating the position of the inlet guide vane  
22 into a surge control system in any way?

23 A. I don't know when we first conceived of  
24 that.

25 MR. LIND: This is another area where I

91

1 I think the witness was not properly prepared under our  
2 30(b)(6) notice, so we'll ask potentially for a  
3 witness to come and testify to those issues.

4 MS. STEVENSON: I obviously disagree, and  
5 for one thing, you haven't showed him a single  
6 document and this is not a memory test as we all  
7 know, so I disagree with your characterization.

8 BY MR. LIND:

9 Q. When you're determining a flow-related  
10 parameter in a surge control system, where can you  
11 measure the pressure -- well, let me strike that  
12 question. Let me take a step back.

13 We talked about two kinds of pressure so  
14 far, total pressure; do you recall talking about  
15 total pressure?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. And we talked about static pressure,  
18 correct?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. And you know of surge control systems  
21 that you've talked about that could use a flow  
22 parameter based on either static pressure alone or a  
23 combination of static and total pressure  
24 measurements, correct?

25 A. I think I said earlier you couldn't just

92

1 use one pressure, static pressure as a flow-related  
2 parameter; that was your question, correct?

3 Q. You could take the difference between two  
4 static pressure measurements at two different places  
5 in the compressor, correct?

6 A. Correct, you need two.

7 Q. As a flow-related parameter?

8 A. As a flow-related parameter.

9 Q. You could also compare measurements of  
10 static pressure and total pressure as a flow-related  
11 parameter in a surge control system, correct?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. And that's a concept that you've been  
14 familiar with for how long?

15 A. Since I've been at Honeywell.

16 Q. And the same with the two static pressure  
17 tap systems, correct?

18 A. Right.

19 Q. Now, in designing a surge control system,  
20 where can you take the static pressure measurements  
21 in order to create your flow-related parameter?

22 MS. STEVENSON: Objection; vague.

23 THE WITNESS: The static -- the limiting  
24 factor is the static pressure measurements -- there  
25 will be a branch that goes to the -- a pipe that goes

93

1 to the customer, and a pipe that goes to the surge  
2 valve, okay, you have to be between the compressor  
3 and a branch in those two pipes. In other words, the  
4 static pressure has -- the total flow has -- it has  
5 to be in a region where the total flow coming out of  
6 the compressor is -- because that's what you're  
7 trying to control --

8 BY MR. LIND:

9 Q. Can you take static pressure measurements  
10 in a surge control system in the pipe what you call  
11 going to the surge bleed valve?

12 A. That -- no.

13 Q. Can you take static pressure measurements  
14 to determine your flow-related parameter in the, what  
15 you called the pipe going to the customer, the  
16 airplane?

17 A. No, no. It's got to be someplace where  
18 the total flow flows through that cross-sectional  
19 area where the static port is. "Total flow" meaning  
20 all the flow that the compressor is putting out.

21 Q. Is what you called the pipe going to  
22 the --

23 A. We're talking about load compressors now;  
24 is that right?

25 Q. Correct.

134

1 good person to call?

2 A. I don't think he would know either; he

3 couldn't tell you specifically either, I don't think.

4 Q. How did -- describe for me the logic in

5 the 331-350 where IGV position was used to determine

6 whether the double solution issue existed?

7 A. Can you repeat the question?

8 Q. Describe for me the logic in the 331-350

9 that used inlet guide vane position to determine

10 whether the double solution issue existed?

11 A. Yeah, I think I already replied to that.

12 There's a -- I believe there's a schedule in there,

13 it's got inlet guide vane position and pressure

14 inputs, and it makes a decision on which side of the

15 curve you're on.

16 Q. Does it compare inlet guide vane position

17 to a pressure ratio?

18 A. Does it compare inlet guide vane position

19 to a pressure ratio?

20 Q. In this schedule.

21 A. The inputs to the schedule, I think, are,

22 if I recall my memory, is in inlet guide vane

23 position and then there's some pressure, some --

24 Q. Why does the double solution problem

25 occur in the 331-350?

135

1 A. Because the static ports were put down in

2 the diffuser.

3 Q. So any time you put static pressure ports

4 in the diffuser, you can exhibit -- and you get

5 supersonic flow in the diffuser, you'll experience

6 this double solution problem?

7 A. Yes, that's right.

8 Q. Where are the static ports in the

9 331-50-- I'm sorry, where are the static pressure

10 ports within the 331-350 diffuser?

11 A. I don't know where they are exactly,

12 they're down -- they're in the diffusers and I don't

13 know the location, that was -- if that was the

14 question.

15 Q. Yes, sir.

16 And is -- when you're -- the 331-350 uses

17 your Delta P/P flow parameter in its surge control

18 system, correct?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. So my understanding of the Delta P/P

21 flow-related parameter is that it is total pressure

22 minus static pressure over total pressure, correct?

23 A. It's total pressure minus static

24 pressure, that quantity over total pressure.

25 Q. In order to get the double solution

136

1 problem, don't you need two static pressure

2 measurements, two static pressure ports?

3 A. No, you can have a total in static.

4 Q. So in the -- in any APU that uses the

5 Delta P/P flow-related parameter, if the static

6 pressure measurement in that parameter is taken in

7 the diffuser and if you get supersonic flow in the

8 diffuser, you'll experience the double solution

9 problem?

10 MS. STEVENSON: Objection; asked and

11 answered several times.

12 THE WITNESS: Any time you get supersonic

13 flow in the diffuser, you get a distortion to that

14 curve.

15 BY MR. LIND:

16 Q. The double solution curve?

17 A. It makes the double solution curve.

18 Q. Do all of the Honeywell APUs you listed

19 earlier that use the Delta P/P flow-related parameter

20 take the static pressure measurement in the diffuser?

21 MS. STEVENSON: Object to the form.

22 THE WITNESS: The 331s -- the 331s all

23 do, I believe.

24 BY MR. LIND:

25 Q. The 331-200, therefore --

137

1 A. I'm sorry, the 331-200 and 250 do not

2 have static taps in the diffuser; it's out in the

3 duct.

4 Q. Is the difference between the control --

5 surge control logic to the 331-200 and the 331-350 be

6 the location of the static pressure taps, then?

7 A. That's correct.

8 Q. Why did you move the static pressure tap

9 from the duct in the 331-200 to the diffuser in the

10 331-350?

11 A. I don't know all the reasons, but I know

12 one reason was to get a larger Delta P signal, which

13 we previously discussed.

14 Q. Because there's an advantage to having

15 the static pressure measurement in the diffuser, as

16 opposed to out in the duct?

17 A. There's advantages and disadvantages and

18 that's one of the advantages.

19 Q. And Honeywell recognized that advantage

20 in changing the surge control logic between the

21 331-200 and the 331-350, correct?

22 A. That was a recognized advantage.

23 Q. And when did Honeywell recognize the

24 advantage of measuring surge -- measuring static

25 pressure in the diffuser, as opposed to the duct?



138

140

1 A. On the 350?

2 Q. On any APU surge control.

3 A. I -- I couldn't tell you.

4 MR. LIND: All right. It's 12:25 by my  
5 count; let's take a break for lunch and then come  
6 back and -- we can go off the record.

7 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. We're going off  
8 the record at 12:27 p.m.

9 (Recessed from 12:27 p.m. until

10 1:32 p.m.)

11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the  
12 record at 1:32 p.m.

13 BY MR. LIND:

14 Q. Mr. Clark, does the 165-9 APU experience  
15 the double solution problem?

16 A. The 165-9 doesn't have a load compressor.

17 Q. You mention that -- so the answer is no?

18 A. The answer is no.

19 Q. You mentioned that the 165-9 originally  
20 sensed a -- strike that.

21 There was a surge control system in the  
22 165-9, correct?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. Where was surge occurring or a problem?

25 A. Where was surge occurring a problem?

1 and asked and answered.

2 THE WITNESS: If you don't have a load  
3 compressor, it's usually a bleed machine. And bleed  
4 machines take off a little bit of bleed flow, but  
5 most of the -- it's an engine, and most of its flow  
6 is going through its own turbine, okay, so if you put

7 the statics down in the diffuser to sense flow, you'd  
8 see a very small change in flow, because most of the  
9 flow is going through the turbine; that's why I said  
10 by design you wouldn't have a double solution

11 problem, because you wouldn't put diffuser statics in  
12 a machine that didn't have a load compressor.

13 BY MR. LIND:

14 Q. In the 165-9 APU, why did you change the  
15 flow parameter from just sensing Delta P to sensing  
16 Delta P/P?

17 A. I may have -- the 165-9, I may have  
18 stated it incorrectly, I think I tried to correct  
19 myself, it's only a Delta P control.

20 Q. It never changed to a Delta P/P?

21 A. No, not to my knowledge, that's true.

22 Q. I want to ask you some more questions  
23 about Honeywell's use of inlet guide vane position to  
24 solve the double solution problem, okay?

25 A. (No audible response.)

139

141

1 Q. Well, I assume if you have a surge  
2 control system, you have the potential for surge and  
3 that's why you have the surge control system; is that  
4 right?

5 A. That's correct.

6 Q. Where was the surge problem in the 165-9  
7 APU?

8 A. Where was the -- it doesn't have a load  
9 compressor, so it's in the power section compressor.

10 Q. Okay. So there was the potential in the  
11 165-9 APU to have surge in the compressor?

12 A. In the compressor.

13 Q. Can you have the double solution problem  
14 in a compressor that is not a load compressor?

15 A. We don't have any diffuser statics in any  
16 compressor that's not a load compressor.

17 Q. That's a different answer to a different  
18 question. Here's my question, can you have the  
19 double solution problem in a compressor that is not a  
20 load compressor?

21 A. By design, I don't think you would.

22 Q. If that compressor had a diffuser, you  
23 could have a double solution problem in a compressor  
24 that is not a load compressor, correct?

25 MS. STEVENSON: Objection; argumentative

1 Q. Why did Honeywell use inlet guide vane  
2 position to solve the double solution problem?

3 MS. STEVENSON: Objection; vague.

4 THE WITNESS: I think -- I didn't work on  
5 that, but I -- they looked for some logic to try and  
6 find out when that occurs, and one of the parameters  
7 that is an influence there is IGV position.

8 BY MR. LIND:

9 Q. One of the reasons that you used IGV  
10 position to solve the double solution problem is that  
11 IGV position influences where you are on the  
12 compressor map, right?

13 A. It changes the compressor map.

14 Q. So yes?

15 A. Yes, it changes the compressor map.

16 Q. Who worked on Honeywell's development of  
17 the surge control system that used IGV position to  
18 solve the double solution problem?

19 MS. STEVENSON: Objection; vague.

20 THE WITNESS: The first -- the first  
21 product that we had that had that was the 331-350,  
22 and I think I've already given that answer.

23 BY MR. LIND:

24 Q. My question is, to the extent you've  
25 given some insight on that before, my question is who



154

1 I have the same inverted V or double solution problem  
2 as the APS-3200 APU, correct?

3 MS. STEVENSON: Object to the form.

4 Misstates the document, and I request that you show  
5 him his declaration if you're going to purport to  
6 quote from it.

7 BY MR. LIND:

8 Q. Isn't that right, sir?

9 THE WITNESS: Is it all right for me to  
10 answer the question?

11 MS. STEVENSON: If you understand the  
12 question and can answer it, you can answer it.

13 THE WITNESS: Okay. These are APUs --  
14 did I say that in my response to Sunstrand's -- okay,  
15 can you repeat the question?

16 BY MR. LIND:

17 Q. You had written earlier in a declaration  
18 in this case that several Honeywell APUs have the  
19 same inverted V or double solution problem as the  
20 Sundstrand APS-3200, correct; you wrote that?

21 MS. STEVENSON: Same objections.

22 THE WITNESS: I can't remember writing  
23 that, but the statement is true.

24 BY MR. LIND:

25 Q. Okay. And then we asked Honeywell in

155

1 this document to tell us what those were, and you see  
2 that they answered, right, in response?

3 A. All right.

4 Q. And if you turn the page onto page 9,  
5 there's a list of Honeywell APUs, correct?

6 A. Correct.

7 Q. And, sir, do each of those Honeywell APUs  
8 exhibit the same double solution problem as the  
9 APS-3200?

10 MS. STEVENSON: Object to the form.

11 THE WITNESS: I -- the 350 does; I can't  
12 speak for the 400, the 500. The 600 has diffuser  
13 statics, and as I recall, we don't have any switching  
14 logic in the 600. Now these 131 -- I know the 131-9B  
15 has logic in there; I assume by "double V solution  
16 problem" it's going to be in any of these  
17 compressors, but is it a problem? Is that correct,  
18 you asked is it a problem?

19 BY MR. LIND:

20 Q. Well, let's break that down. For each of  
21 the compressors listed at page 9 of Exhibit 4, do  
22 they have the potential, because of where the  
23 pressure measurements are taken, to exhibit the  
24 double solution curve?

25 A. They have the potential.

156

Q. Now, in which of the compressors listed  
2 at page 9 of Exhibit 4 is there -- do they experience  
3 the double solution problem?

4 A. Actually have a problem?

5 Q. Yes.

6 A. I know the 350 does, and I believe this  
7 131-9B.

8 Q. B, as in boy?

9 A. B, as in boy.

10 Q. Any others?

11 A. And I -- I can't tell you on any of the  
12 others for sure.

13 Q. Now, what's the difference between the  
14 331-350 and the 331-9B, as opposed to all the others,  
15 that make you certain that --

16 A. You mean the 131 --

17 Q. I'm sorry, let me start over, you're  
18 right. What's different between the 331-350 and the  
19 131-9B, as compared to the other APUs listed on page  
20 209, that makes those two APUs experience the double  
21 solution problem?

22 A. I can't -- I don't know for sure, but if  
23 you're not pulling a bunch of flow, you don't get  
24 into that, and that can be on aircraft that can be  
25 just how it matches out on the aircraft, that is a

157

1 speculation, I do not know.

2 Q. The -- which of the APUs on page 9 of  
3 Exhibit 4 use logic that uses the inlet guide vane  
4 position to solve the double solution problem,  
5 so-called switching logic, as you called it?

6 A. The 331-350 and I believe the 131-9B.

7 Q. Would the 331-200 also have the potential  
8 for the double solution problem, if it didn't  
9 experience it?

10 A. It does not have diffuser statics, you  
11 said 331-200, correct?

12 Q. Correct.

13 A. It would not have it because it does not  
14 have diffuser statics.

15 Q. When you say it does not have diffuser  
16 statics, do you mean it does not have pressure taps  
17 in the diffuser?

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. But all of the APUs listed on page 9 of  
20 Exhibit 4 have pressure taps in the diffuser?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. And in any of the APUs listed on page 9  
23 of Exhibit 4, that solve the double solution problem  
24 using inlet guide vane position like the 331-350 --  
25 let me rephrase that, that didn't make any sense.

202

1 A. We were in competition with Lycoming, I  
2 thought was our competitor.  
3 Q. With who?  
4 A. Lycoming.  
5 Q. Lycoming?  
6 A. Lycoming.  
7 Q. Are you sure about that or that's just  
8 your best recollection right now?  
9 A. That's my best recollection.  
10 Q. Do you recall one of the Hamilton  
11 Sundstrand or predecessor companies offering an APU  
12 for the 757 in the late 1970s?  
13 A. I don't recall that.  
14 Q. You mentioned the L-1011; what do you  
15 know about the APU for the L-1011?  
16 A. I don't know anything about it.  
17 Q. Do you know who makes it?  
18 A. That was Ham Standard, I believe.  
19 Q. You talked about the APU called the 131-3  
20 earlier today, right?  
21 A. Right.  
22 Q. And that's the one that uses your  
23 Delta P/Delta P surge control system, correct?  
24 A. That's correct.  
25 Q. And does the 131-3 experience the

203

1 potential for the double solution characteristic?  
2 A. It does not have that characteristic.  
3 Q. And why not?  
4 A. It does not have a multi-valued curve.  
5 All I know is it, from data we don't have it, and we  
6 did not see it. I cannot tell you the physical  
7 reason, because I don't know.  
8 Q. Are any of the pressure measurements in  
9 the surge control system for the 131-3 static  
10 pressure?  
11 A. Yes, there's three pressure taps; two of  
12 them are static pressures in the diffuser.  
13 Q. So in the 131-3 you have static pressure  
14 taps in the diffuser, correct?  
15 A. That's correct.  
16 Q. And you have two static pressure taps in  
17 the diffuser, correct?  
18 A. On each -- on both sides of the vane.  
19 Q. But there are two, correct?  
20 A. To be specific, there's -- I don't know  
21 how many vanes in there, and I believe each one has  
22 two of these, so I don't want to say there's only  
23 two, but they all collected in a manifold, I'm just  
24 trying to be precise here, but there's two, you could  
25 say that there's two main -- two important ones or

204

1 there's two on each side of a vane.  
2 Q. In the 131-3 there are at least two  
3 static pressure taps in the diffuser?  
4 A. That's correct.  
5 Q. And then there's a third pressure sensor,  
6 correct?  
7 A. There's a third pressure.  
8 Q. What pressure does that measure or sense,  
9 static or total?  
10 A. I can't remember exactly whether that's a  
11 static or a total, but it's in an area of low  
12 velocity, so it's a -- so if it's a -- it's closer to  
13 a total, it's not down in the diffuser. I believe  
14 it's out on the scroll someplace.  
15 Q. You believe that the third pressure tap  
16 in the 131-3 is past the diffuser out in the scroll?  
17 A. It's out in the scroll, I believe.  
18 Q. When you measure static pressure at the  
19 far end of the diffuser, is that essentially the same  
20 as measuring total pressure?  
21 A. It's much closer to total pressure.  
22 Q. And the closer you go to the very end of  
23 the diffuser discharge --  
24 A. The closer it gets to total pressure.  
25 Q. I'll accept that, even though we weren't

205

1 supposed to talk over each other, I think that one  
2 worked out okay.  
3 Although you haven't experienced the  
4 double solution problem in the 131-3, do you agree  
5 that because you're taking static pressure  
6 measurements in the diffuser, that the potential for  
7 the double solution problem exists?  
8 MS. STEVENSON: Objection; calls for  
9 speculation.  
10 THE WITNESS: Are you calling in that  
11 application, in the way that we did it, is that what  
12 you're saying? In other words, if I have two  
13 pressure holes down there, that the potential exists  
14 for the double V solution.  
15 BY MR. LIND:  
16 Q. Yeah, in the 131-3, because you have two  
17 static pressure sensors in the diffuser, doesn't the  
18 potential for the double solution problem exist?  
19 A. I don't believe so. As I explained  
20 later, the signal does not turn around and go back,  
21 it's not double valued as in the double V solution.  
22 Q. And you don't know why that is, though?  
23 A. All I know is it doesn't do that, and I  
24 do not know the physical reason.  
25 Q. At least you haven't experienced the peak